Dr. STILLINGFLEETS PRINCIPLES OF PROTESTANCY

Cleared, Confuted, and Retorted.

AND THE

INFALLIBILITY

OF THE

ROMAN-CATHOLICK CHURCH

Asserted; And that the same Church alone is the whole CATHOLICK CHURCH.

IN A

Letter from a Catholick Gentleman to a Protestant Knight.

Printed in the Year, 1673.

THE PUBLISHER TO THE READER:

NOtwithſtanding the Multiplicity of Learned and ſolid Anſwers to Dr. Stillingfleets Principles of Chriſtianity, I thought fit alſo to publiſh this Short and Subſtantial Peece (though neglected by the Anthor) as more particularly ſuited for men endowed with ſtrength of Reaſon and Judgement, yet not much verſed in Book-Learning.

SIR,

ACcording to your deſire, I have peruſed Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Diſcourſe of *Idolatry*, and his *Principles of Proteſtancy*; To deliver my Opinion of either, ſeemeth to be ſuperfluous, it being credible both are anſwered in *England* ere now. But becauſe you preſs me to it, and the Anſwer may be as long expected here, as the Book hath been, I will venture to give my Judgement of Dr. *Stillingfleet*; and do confeſſe ingeniouſly, that of all Proteſtant Writers I ever read, I take him to be not only the wittieſt, but the wiſeſt; eſpecially where he rallies and endeavours to make the Roman Religion, ridiculous. For to imagine that rational men can be moved by ſerious Diſcourſes, to believe, that God would ſend *Martin Luther*, *John Calvin*, *Martin Bucer*, *Thomas Cranmer*, &c. to reform Chriſtianity (their lives having been ſo ſcandalous and un-chriſtianlike) or that he would oblige the world to credit ſuch vicious men, without ſhewing any Credentials, or Miracles, to confirm their Teſtimony, and new ſenſe of Scripture; is to make God take a new and unreaſonable Method. Therefore Dr. *Stillingfleet* had very good Reaſons not to inſiſt upon this old and ordinary way of his Proteſtant Controverſers; he fixt upon a better for his own purpoſe, which is, to rail at the Saints, and rally us out of their Religion and

Miracles.

Miracles. But notwithſtanding the judicious choice of his new Method, I humbly conceive he hath overſhot himſelf by aiming ſo high, and letting his arrows fly againſt ſo ancient a Patriarch as St. *Bennet*, of whoſe ſupernatural gifts and Miracles never any one doubted that believed ſo authentick an Authour and Doctor of Gods Church as * St. *Gregory the Great*, who writ his Life: And truly Dr. *Stillingfleet* is the firſt Proteſtant Doctor I heard of did except againſt St. *Gregories* ſincerity or ſufficiency in relating matters of fact or faith. He might think fit to make bold with S. *Ignatius* becauſe he was Founder of the Jeſuites with St. *Dominick* alſo becauſe he invented the Inquiſition; But to think that his Raillery could reach to diſcredit the Miracles and Sanctity of S. *Bennet*, and the Teſtimony of S. *Gregory the Great* is an unpardonable Crime. And yet D. *Stillingfleets* Friends (and his Enemies) may excuſe the heinouſneſs of this Crime, by the impoſſibility of De-

* Biſhop *Godwin* in his Catalogue of Biſhops, &c. *p.* 3. ſaith, That bleſſed and holy Father, S. *Gregory* was the occaſion of Re-planting the Chriſtian Faith in our Countrey. The ſame ſaith D. *Whitaker contra Durum*, *lib.* 5. *p.* 394. M. *Bell* in his *Survey of Popery*, *p.* 187. termeth him, S. *Gregory* ſurnamed *the Great*, *the holy and Learned Biſhop of Rome*. D. *Humphrey* in his *Jeſuit. ſm. par.* 2. *p.* 624. ſaith, *Gregory* both in Name, and in very Deed Great, was indued with many Gifts of divine grace. S. *Iſidore de Script. Eccleſiaſt. c.* 27. ſaith, *Gregory* Biſhop of the Apoſtolick See of *Rome*, &c. was by the grace of the holy Ghoſt ſo greatly indued with light of knowledge, as no Doctor of this preſent Age or in times paſt was equal to him. S. *John Damaſcen* ſpeaking of his Dialogues, and the life of S. *Bennet*, which S. *Gregory* writ, ſaith, Let *Gregory* that wrote the Book of Dialogues, Biſhop of the elder *Rome*, be brought forth, a man as all know, that was renowned both for holineſs of life and learning, &c.

fending

fending his Cauſe, otherwiſe then by facing us down, that all the Roman-Catholick Prelats and Preachers ſince the Primitive times, were either ſo witleſs, as to be ſeduced by fooliſh Saints and feign'd Miracles; or ſo wicked, as to conſpire (againſt Gods known Worſhip and plain Word) to damn themſelves and poſterity. And withall, were ſo obſtinate in adhering to the Errours of Popery, that in whatſoever Age any Preachers began to reform that Doctrine, they were ſuddenly cried down and condemned as notorious Hereticks, by the Prelats and Councils of the then viſible Church. But leaving this to the Anſwerers of D. *Stillingfleets* Book, I will paſs to his Principles.

Dr. *Stillingfleets* PRINCIPLES Cleared, Confuted, and Retorted.

Of his Six Principles pretended to be agreed upon on both Sides.

TO his three firſt Principles I have nothing to ſay.

D. *Stillingfleets* Fourth Principle is.

That in order to mans obeying the Will of God, it is neceſſary that he Know what it is. for which ſome manifeſtation of the Will of God is neceſſary both that man may know what he hath to do, and that God may juſtly puniſh him if he do it not.

Principle V.

Whatever God reveals to man, is infallibly true, and being intended for the Rule of mans Obedience, may be certainly known to be his Will.

HIs Fourth Principle muſt be examined before any Chriſtian can agree with him in it: If he means that in order to mans obeying the Will of God, it is neceſſary that he *know* what it is, with *clear* or *undeniable* Evidence, the Principle is falſe; it is ſufficient that he knows what Gods Will is, by *Credible* Teſtimony, or publick authority, though the infallible certainty thereof

thereof doth not clearly appear. So children are bound under pain of damnation to honour their Parents, and Subjects to obey their Soveraigns, though no infallible certainty appeareth that they are their Parents, or Soveraigns. In like manner though no undeniable certainty appears to us that God ſpeaketh or declareth his Will by Scripture, or by his Church, yet we are bound under pain of damnation to beleeve, that what is propoſed and commanded by them, is the Word and Will of God, and accordingly we ought to obey.

The reaſon of this aſſertion is, that mans underſtanding being imperfect, its aſſent is more frequently directed by outward ſigns to the truth, than by any immediate ſight of the ſame. And therefore, even in things of greateſt concern, we are accuſtomed (and indeed for want of better evidence, forc't) to rely upon the Tradition, Teſtimony, and Information of others; and thereupon to ground our judicial decrees, and Sentences both in Church and State. This Cuſtom being agreeable to reaſon and the Law of nature, it cannot be againſt either to conform our ſelves thereunto in ſupernatural Myſteries, or matters of Faith; ſeeing we underſtand leſſe of theſe than of any others. Therefore not only the Fourth Principle, but the Fifth alſo which Dr. *Stillingfleet* pretends to be agreed unto on both ſides, are falſe, inaſmuch as they ſuppoſe that a clear and certain knowledge of Gods Revelation and Will is neceſſary for believing the one and obeying the other.

Beſides, it is a prerogative due to Superiors, not to be obliged to ſignifie their will and pleaſure to their Subjects by themſelves immediately, but may and do

do appoint their ſubordinate Officers to publiſh and proclaim their commands, either by word of mouth or writing. And though Dr. *Stillingfleet* (in his ſeventh Principle) ſeems to grant, God ought to enjoy this Prerogative, yet (if he proceeds conſequently) he muſt deny it, ſeeing there can be no clear undeniable certainty of Gods revealing or commanding, when he truſts his Revelations and Commands to the proposal and Miniſtry of others, though confirmed by ſuch Miracles as Chriſt himſelf and his Apoſtles wrought; becauſe ſuch Miracles do not clearly demonſtrate that themſelves are ſupernatural (as is manifeſt by the obſtinate Jews, who attributed them to *Beelzebub*) or that the Doctrin confirmed by them, is Divine; or that the words uttered or written by men, is the Word of God. If therefore a clear certainty or Demonſtrative Evidence of Gods Will and Revelation be requiſite for Chriſtian Obedience and belief, we deprive God of that Prerogative which is inſeparable from Soveraigns, and conſiſts in the Obligation of their Subjects to beleeve and obey them, when they ſpeak and command by ſubordinate Officers, though theſe ſhew no clear or undeniable evidence for their office; ſome ſigns Gods Miniſters muſt ſhew as Seals of their Commiſſion, which may create (even in the moſt ſcrupulous) a moral certainty of Divine Truth and Truſt repoſed in them; but no ſuch undeniable evidence of Gods revealing and commanding by them as D. *Stillingfleet* and all Proteſtants are forc't to exact, by not contenting themſelves with that moral certainty and evidence of ſupernatural ſignes which is viſible in the Roman-Catholick Church.

And truly by exacting greater evidence of Gods Reve-

Revelations then appears by the ſignes of the Roman-Catholick Church, Dr. *Stillingfleet* deſtroys all Religion, and the nature of Chriſtian Faith, which according to S. *Paul*, *Heb.* 11. involves obſcurity, or the *Not-appearance* of the Truth of Myſteries believed: And reaſon, dictates that *belief* or *faith*, being by its own nature and primitive notion but an imperfect ſight, whereby we make a ſhift to ſupply the want of clearer knowledge, to make it compatible with a clearer certainty of the truth believed, or with more then a moral evidence of Gods Revelation (which is certainly and clearly connected with the truth believed, becauſe it cannot deceive, nor be deceived) is to maintain, that we want, and do not want that clearneſs of knowledge whereof Faith doth ſuppoſe us defective, and ſupplyeth the defect: Theſe Premiſſes being thus proved, there can be no difficulty in diſcovering the fraud and falſhood of D. *Stillingfleets* Principles and Concluſions; and therefore granting his ſixth, laſt, and common Principle, I will proceed to his particular Propoſitions, mentioning only ſuch as I do impugn.

Dr. *Stillingfleets Faith of Proteſtants reduced to Principles*, is Falſe;

The *Roman-Catholick Faith* Reſolved into the Inconſiſtency of its Falſhood with Gods Veracity.

Propoſition IV.

Nothing ought to be admitted for Divine Revelation, which overthrows the certainty of thoſe Principles which muſt be antecedently ſuppoſed to all Divine Revelation, for that were to overthrow the means whereby we are to judge concerning the truth of any Divine Revelation.

Propoſition V.

There can be no other means imagined whereby we are to judge of the truth of Divine Revelation, but a faculty in us of diſcerning truth and falſhood in matters propoſed to our belief, which if we do not exerciſe in judging the truth of Divine Revelation, we muſt be impoſed upon by every thing which pretends to be ſo.

Propoſition VI.

The pretence of Infallibility in any perſon or ſociety of men muſt be judged in the ſame way that the truth of Divine Revelation is &c.

D. *Stil-*

DR. *Stillingfleets* firſt and ſecond Propoſition may paſs, and his third alſo, if the word *certain* be rightly underſtood; but his Fourth Propoſition, if therein he ſuppoſeth that every one is to be judge concerning the truth of Divine Revelation, is falſe; as alſo the Fifth, wherein he makes our humane Underſtanding a ſufficient faculty, nay, the only means of diſcerning the truth and falſhood in matters propoſed to our belief, and of Divine Revelations. For, the Objects of Divine Revelation are frequently Myſteries ſo ſublime, that they far exceed all humane or natural capacity: how therefore can their truth or falſhood be judged of by natural reaſon, above its own reach? And as for the Divine Revelation it ſelf, all Divines grant its Exiſtence (and by conſequence its truth) cannot be known by natural reaſon, and therefore ſay, that albeit you may prove the Exiſtence of God by natural reaſon, yet you cannot by the ſame faculty prove the Exiſtence of any one of his Revelations, becauſe theſe, taking their denomination from the exercise of Gods liberty, are no ſubject for humane demonſtration, or concluding diſcourſes, unleſs you will confine Gods free choice to one of thoſe many contrary Decrees he might have fixt upon, *ab æterno*. But of this Subject more in the Confutation of his ſixth Concluſion.

To make every mans private judgement the touch-ſtone of what is Divine Revelation, for fear (forſooth) of being impoſed upon by every thing which pretends to be ſo, *is* to take too much upon our ſelves, and favours more of the *private Spirit*, then of that pious affection and profound ſubmiſſion, wherewith St. *Paul* bids us *captivate our underſtandings to the obedience of faith*.

faith. But ſurely Dr. *Stillingfleet* doth not conſider what ill uſe himſelf makes of his diſcerning faculty, when he judges that the Proteſtant Reformation is Divine Revelation; let him reflect upon the incredibility of Gods permitting his Church to lurk in deſarts, or to lie in Errours from the Primitive times until *Martin Luther*'s appearance, *Anno* 1517. he will finde there is very little judgement exerciſed in giving that man, or any of his Comrades ſo much credit, as to forſake the ſence of Scripture, which the Church then, and for many preceding Ages held, for new fancies and inventions of *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Calvin*, and other debaucht Prieſts and Fryars, without any other warrant for ſo great an undertaking but their own word, impudently pretending that they were ſent and inſpired by God to plant a Doctrine ſuitable enough to the lewdneſs of their own lives, and confeſſedly * contrary to the ſence and practice of the greateſt Doctors and Saints of Gods Church. A man that can beleeve this, may be credulous enough to think he can perſwade the world to look upon all Miracles as miſtakes, and upon the Saints that wrought them as fools and phanaticks. But if Dr. *Stillingfleet* will ſecure him elf and all Proteſtants from impoſtures, let him enquire into the mo-

* Luther *tom.* 5. *Witenb. in Galat. c.* 1. *fol.* 250. & in *Coll. q. Menſal. fol.* 273. & *tom.* 7. *Witenb. An.* 1558. *in lib. de miſſa privata, fol.* 443. 228. ſaith, Doſt thou O ſole man take upon thee ſo great matters? What if thou being but one, offendeſt? If God permit ſo many, and all to erre, why may he not permit thee to erre? Hitherto appertain thoſe Arguments, the Church, the Church, the Fathers, the Fathers, the Councils, the Cuſtomes, the multitudes and greatneſs of wiſe men, whom do not thoſe clouds and doubts, yea, theſe ſeas of examples overwhelm?

tives

tives and Miracles which induce us to beleeve that the Roman-Catholick Church is infallibly aſſiſted by God in delivering and interpreting his Word, and Revelations.

He will not then preſume to make every mans private Judgement (according to his 5. and 6. Propoſition) the only ballance of ſo weighty an affair, neither will he prefer his own particular opinion before the publick Teſtimony and conſtant Tradition of Chriſtendom for many Ages, eſpecially if he will examine whether Gods Veracity, Goodneſs and Providence be conſiſtent with permitting fraud or falſhood in that Doctrine which a Church (in all appearance) miraculous, and ſupernaturally qualified, propoſeth as divine: Whether the Miracles of the Roman-Catholick Church be true or falſe, we diſpute not at preſent, but only averr, that ſeeing ſo many * wiſe and wary men

* See S. *Aug. de Civit. Dei lib.* 22. *c.* 8. where amongſt other Miracles he telleth, how that in the preſence of him and others, a devout woman called *Palladia*, was ſuddenly cured by praying to St. *Stephen*, and at his Monument his words are, *Ad ſanctum Martyrem venire perexeat, quæ mox ut cancellos attigit, ſana ſurrexit.* S. *Malachias* Miracles you may ſee in his life written by S. *Bernard*, who ſays, in what kinde of old Miracles did not *Malachias* excel? he wanted not Prophecy, not Revelation, not the gift of healing; and to conclude, not raiſing of the dead; and relates them particularly, as alſo how himſelf aſſiſting at *Malachias* his death, got his bleſſing; and after he expired, took his hand, and laying it on the withered and uſeleſs hand of a boy then preſent, he was reſtored to perfect health; becauſe in the dead Saint ſaith S. *Bernard*, lived the grace of curing diſeaſes. All theſe and other more ancient and modern Miracles (as thoſe of S. *Bernard* himſelf) are by the Century Writers, *Oſiander*, and moſt Proteſtant Authors, ſaid to be cheats, deluſions, or inchantments, See

Oſiander for one, in *Epit. cent.* 12. *pag.* 310. *Partim permiſſione Dei præſtigiis Satanicis effecta exiſtimo*; not, ſaith he, that I think S. *Bernard* was a Magician, but it is likely Satan wrought ſuch Miracles to confirm Idolatry, and the worſhip of Saints, *&c.* See S. *Xavier* his Miracles wrought to convert the *Indians* and *Japonians* to Popery, himſelf being a Jeſuite.

in every Age for at leaſt a 1000. years, and after a ſevere Scrutiny and ſerious ſtudy, have judged our moſt authentick Miracles true, if all theſe men ſhould be miſtaken, none can be condemned for following their judgement; And all prudent and learned men muſt confeſſe it is a myſtery not intelligible, how the infinite Veracity of God can be infinitely averſe from fraud and falſhood, if he permits both the one and the other to be countenanc't and promoted by apparent Miracles, ſo plauſibly fathered upon the Divine Omnipotency, that ſuch as pretend them to be counterfeit, cannot diſcover the fraud nor diſprove the fact; nor finde out any natural cauſe to work ſuch prodigious effects; and therefore are forc't (imitating the obſtinate Jews) to attribute them to the power of *Beelzebub*, or to the craft of thoſe very Monks which (they would have the world beleeve, were mad-men; and yet now make them ſo witty, as to contrive the cheat ſo cunningly, and to counterfeit ſupernatural Miracles ſo naturally, that our Proteſtant Adverſaries have been hitherto as unſucceſsful in diſcovering any fallacy in them (I mean ſtill thoſe which moved the Popes to canonize Saints) as the firſt Reformers *Luther* and *Calvin* were unfortunate in being convicted of Folly and Forgery in imitating them, when the one attempted to caſt out the devil in *Germany*, and the other to revive the dead in *Geneva*.

Propo-

Propoſition XIV.

To ſuppoſe the Books ſo written to be imperfect, i.e. *that any things neceſſary to be believed or practiſed are not contained in them, is either to charge the firſt Author of them with fraud, and not delivering his whole minde; or the Writers with inſincerity in not ſetting down, and the whole Chriſtian Church of the firſt ages with folly in believing the fulneſs and perfection of the Scriptures, in order to ſalvation.*

Propoſition XV.

Theſe Writings being owned as containing in them the whole Will of God, ſo plainly revealed, that no ſober Enquirer can miſs of what is neceſſary for ſalvation, there can be no neceſſity ſuppoſed of any infallible Society of men either to atteſt or explain theſe Writings, &c.

Propoſition XVI.

There can be no more intolerable uſurpation upon the faith of Chriſtians, then for any perſon or Society of men to pretend to an aſſiſtance as infallible in what they propoſe as was in Chriſt or his Apoſtles, without giving any equal degree of evidence that they are ſo aſſiſted, as Chriſt and his Apoſtles did, viz. *by Miracles as great, publick and convincing as theirs were, by which, I mean, ſuch as are wrought by theſe very perſons who challenge this Infallibility, and with a deſign for the conviction of thoſe who do not believe it.*

The 7.8.9.10.11.12. and 13. Propoſitions, are but ſo many Prefaces to induce us to beleeve the 14. which ſays, that if all things neceſſary to be believed or practiſed, are not contained in the Holy Scriptures of the New

New and Old Teſtament, it followeth that God was fraudulent in not delivering his whole minde, or that the Writers were inſincere in not ſetting it down, and the whole Chriſtian Church of the firſt ages, fools, for believing the fulneſs and perfection of the Scriptures, in order to Salvation. Theſe conſequences ſuppoſe (but 'tis not proved) that God promiſed or decreed to deliver his whole minde ſo plainly in the Scriptures concerning all things neceſſary for Salvation, that every one may eaſily underſtand his meaning, and that the Primitive Church believed ſo: But this agreeth not with the Records of Antiquity, nor with the words of S. *Peter*, 2 *Pet.* 3. 16. ſaying, that in S. *Pauls* Epiſtles there were ſome things hard to be underſtood, and eaſily wreſted by men to their damnation: And is further demonſtrated to be falſe, by the continual conteſtations of Proteſtants againſt the Roman-Catholick ſence of Scripture about Image-worſhip (whether it be prohibited in the Second Commandement) and many other Controverſies, as the Real Preſence, *&c.* For if Scripture (or Gods meaning therein) were as plain as is pretended in the 15. Propoſition, conſciencious, ſober and learned men could not differ ſo irreconcileably in the true ſence thereof. Wherefore nothing is more clear to men in Scripture, then that Scripture is not clear, and that God did not intend it for the only Rule of Salvation; and by conſequence, that it is not repugnant to the wiſdome and goodneſs of God, not to ſet down all his will in writing in the Law of grace, or not agreeable to the ſame, that God make men infallible in writing ſo much of his will as is contained in Scripture (or even all that is neceſſary for Salvation;) though that writing be not clear to every ſincere and

ſober

ſober perſon, 'tis ſufficient it may be explained to every man by the Doctors and Paſtors of the Church; according to that of *Deut.*17.8. *Thou ſhalt go to the Prieſts to enquire, and they ſhall ſhew thee. Deut.* 33. 10. *They ſhall teach thy Law. Neh.* 8.8. *They cauſed the people to underſtand the Law.* And *Mat.*23.2. *They ſat in Moſes chair, all things therefore*, &c. which laſt Text doth not agree with the Propoſition, ſaying, that for ſome ages before Chriſt there was no body infallible among the Jews, to atteſt or explain to them the Writings of *Moſes*, or the Prophets. As for the Teſtimonies of the New Teſtament, ſee *Mat.*7. 24. and 13.19. and 24. 14. 16. and 28. 19. and *Mark* 16. 15. and *Matth.* 18. 17. &c.

But Dr. *Stillingfleet* will demonſtrate by his 16. Propoſition, That the Roman-Catholick Church is intolerable by its pretending to Gods infallible aſſiſtance in propoſing matters of faith. And why ſo? Becauſe forſooth every Preacher of that Church doth not work as great Miracles as Chriſt and his Apoſtles. Doth every Proteſtant Preacher work ſuch Miracles? Did you Dr. *Stillingfleet*? Did any of your Church, or Reformation, ever work a Miracle? If not, why do you expect or exact that any ſhould beleeve your Reformation, or that your Church is aſſiſted by the holy Ghoſt? If all rational perſons muſt grant, that Miracles are neceſſary to plant any new Doctrine pretended to be divine, how much more neceſſary muſt they be to reverſe the old, and reject Doctrine held for many ages as Divine and confirmed as ſuch by ſo many Prodigies, againſt whoſe ſupernaturality our adverſaries have no other Arguments then their own arbitrary Interpretations of Scripture, and thoſe things which the Jews ob-

jected against the Doctrine and Miracles of Christ and his Apostles? This much we may at least exact and expect from Dr *Stillingfleet*, that he will either confesse the truth of our Doctrine and Miracles, or confute them by some better reason then by a bare supposition, that they are against Scripture; or by rashly averring they are but tricks of covetous Monks and crafty * Jesuites. Other Protestant Writers confesse ingeniously that our Massing Priests and Jesuites have wrought many true Miracles in the *Indies*, *Japan*, *Congo*, and *China*, converting those Nations to Popery. And Mr. *Hartwell* || speaking of the Conversion of the Kingdom of *Congo*, saith, *Shall this Action, which tendeth to the Glory of God, be concealed, and not committed to memory, because it was performed by Popish Priests, and Popish means? God forbid.*

If Dr. *Stillingfleet* thinks that his Church, or the Reformation by not pretending to Miracles, or Infallibility in proposing matters of Faith, be a more certain and safe Guide to Salvation, then the Roman-Catholick Church, that with undeniable moral evidence pretends to both, few considering and conscientious persons will be of his opinion; it being a clear principle in Moral Theology, That in matters of Eternity we are bound to choose the surest way; and no prudent man will deny, but that it is a surer way to Heaven, to be directed by a Guide that pretends to be certain of that way, and produceth moral evidence for

* Dr *Field* in his Treatise of the Church, *lib.*3. *cap.*48. || M. *Abraham Hartwell* in his Report of the Kingdom of *Congo*, *edit. An.*1597. in his Epistle to the Reader. *Symon Lythus in Respons. altera ad alteram.* Gretseri *Apol. pag.*331. Daneus *contra* Bellar. *pag.*781.

that

that certainty, then to follow a guide that plainly confeſſeth his own uncertainty of the way, and hath nothing to ſay againſt the moral evidence and aſſurance of the other, but railing Raillery, or turning to *Ridicule* ſuch forged and incredible Miracles as we our ſelves diſcover, and puniſh.

To conclude, it is not neceſſary that every particular Doctor or Preacher of the Faith, ſhew or work a Miracle, 'tis ſufficient that any one of that Faith do it, or did it, to prove the Faith and Infallibility of the Roman Church: If this be credibly reported to the diſſenters, they are bound to beleeve it and become Roman Catholicks. *Herod* never did ſee any of Chriſt or the Apoſtles Miracles, at leaſt many of the Jews did not, and yet they who heard them credibly reported, were obliged under pain of damnation to beleeve the Chriſtian doctrine, becauſe they were credibly informed that it was confirmed by Miracles; So that it is a raſh miſtake to maintain, that no Proteſtant is bound to ſubmit to the Authority and Doctrine of the Roman-Catholick Church, unleſs he be convinct firſt by ſeeing a Miracle; Such things as are own'd to be Miracles by our Church, are ſo well examined, and ſo authentickly proved, that any one may prudently beleeve them; for though perhaps none now living did ſee them, yet many credible perſons that lived when they were wrought, did ſee them, and we may rely upon their ſight and ſearch with as much Reaſon and more Religion, then upon our own, according to Chriſts ſaying to S. *Thomas*, *Bleſſed are they who have not ſeen, and yet believed.*

Pro-

Propoſition XVII.

Nothing is more abſurd then to pretend the neceſſity of ſuch an infallible Commiſſion and aſſiſtance to aſſure us of the truth of theſe Writings, and to interpret them, and at the ſame time to prove that Commiſſion from thoſe Writings from which we are told nothing can be certainly deduced, ſuch an aſſiſtance not being ſuppoſed; or to pretend that Infallibility in a body of men, is not as liable to doubts and diſputes as in thoſe Books from whence only they derive their Infallibility.

The 17. Propoſition is a groſs or wilful miſtake of the Roman-Catholick Doctrine; We do not ground the Infallibility of the Church upon the words of Scripture which aſſert it, but upon an impoſſibility or incredibility, that God would permit ſuch a Church as the Roman-Catholick, qualified with ſo many ſeeming ſupernatural ſignes of his favour and ſeals of his Divine Commiſſion, as our Miracles, Sanctity, Converſion of Nations to Chriſtianity, *&c.* upon an Impoſſibility: I ſay, that God would permit a Church ſo apparently qualified with ſupernatural Marks of Divine * Authority, to leade men into any errour, when it pretends to propoſe and declare Gods Revelation; This we ſay is not compatible with Gods Veracity, or with his infinite ſincerity or inclination to truth, and averſneſſe from falſhood, whether in fundamental, or not fundamental points of faith. For, even amongſt men, he that is very ſincere, or much inclined to truth, and averſe

* See Father *Thomas Bartons Treatiſe of Religion and Government, edit.* 1670. where he cleareth this point, as alſo the obſcurity of Chriſtian faith.

from

from falſhood, will not permit any one (if he can help it) to abuſe his name or authority by counterfeiting his Commiſſions or Seals, much leſs can it be imagined by any ſober perſon that God who is ſincerity and truth it ſelf, would permit (he being omnipotent) the Roman-Catholick Church to abuſe his ſacred Name and aſſume his authority by counterfeit Seals, or falſe Miracles, and thereby to ſeduce the world for ſo many ages as that Church hath been prudently taken to be the ſole true Church of God. So that you muſt grant 1. The Roman-Catholick Miracles (approved of in the Bulls of Canonization of Saints) to be true, and by conſequence it ſelf to be infallibly aſſiſted by God, independently of, and antecedently to any words of Scripture; and if the Miracles be true, there can be no diſpute of the Truth of its Doctrine, or of the authentickneſſe of its Commiſſion. 2. You muſt grant, that if its Miracles were falſe, there could be no proof or faith of Gods Veracity, this being inconſiſtent with the permiſſion of a cheat ſo apparently ſupernatural. We reſolve therefore Chriſtian and Catholick Faith into this Aſſertion or Aſſent and Aſſurance; *Gods Veracity being Infinite, I do moſt firmly and undoubtedly beleeve, that God will never permit any falſhood to be propoſed as his Word or Revelation, with ſuch appearance of Miracles, and ſuch ſigns of his approbation, as the Roman-Catholick Church propoſeth its Doctrine and Infallibility: And therefore whatſoever the ſame Church doth propoſe as Gods Word or Revelation, I do moſt firmly and undoubtedly beleeve as the real Word and Revelation of God.* To this univerſal Aſſent or Aſſertion are reduced all the particular Aſſents or Articles of Catholick Faith, without any kinde of that circle which Schoolmen ſo much

dread in the reſolution of faith: Neither is there any circle in proving the evident credibility of the Roman-Catholick Church by its Miracles, and the truth of its Miracles by the approbation of the ſame Church. 1. Becauſe we prove the Credibility of the Church by the ſole moral appearance that our Miracles are Divine, before they are believed to be Divine by ſupernatural faith. 2. Becauſe both the truth of our Miracles, and the Infallibility of our Church are proved by the Infiniteneſſe of Gods Veracity, which is not conſiſtent with a permiſſion of our Miracles being falſe, or of our Church being fallible, as hath been hitherto declared.

As to the Second part of the 17. Propoſition, it's manifeſt to common ſenſe, that doubts and diſputes are with more eaſe and clearneſs reſolved by an infallible body of men, then by an obſcure (though infallible) Writing: Men may hear, and anſwer difficulties and doubts, a Book (even the Bible) cannot, becauſe we prove it is obſcure (even after all conferences of texts, and Examinations of the able Scripturiſts) by reaſon of the differences in opinion concerning the true ſence thereof.

The 18. Propoſition is grounded upon the falſhood of the 17. and therefore needeth no other confutation: but as to what it ſays, God had promiſed to particular men who endeavour to underſtand Scripture, that either they ſhall not err, or if they ſhall, they ſhall not be damn'd for it, is but a fancy of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, without any proof or colour of truth, and contrary to Chriſts commands of hearing and obeying the Church.

The 19. Propoſition contains only a falſe ſuppoſition confuted in the 17. and an inclination in D. *Stillingfleet*

to

to the private ſpirit, againſt the publick Teſtimony of the Church.

Propoſition XX.

No mans faith can therefore be infallible, meerly becauſe the Proponent is ſaid to be infallible, becauſe the nature of Aſſent doth not depend upon the objective infallibility of any thing without us, but is agreeable to the evidence we have of it in our mindes; for Aſſent is not built on the nature of things, but their evidence to us.

The 20. Propoſition wants explanation: There are two ſorts of Aſſent, one is grounded upon clear evidence of the truth aſſented unto, and is an intellectual ſight thereof, the other is grounded upon authority, that is, upon the Author or Speakers Veracity or Inclination to truth: The firſt kinde of aſſent is agreeable, and bears proportion with the evidence we have of it in our mindes, and is infallible if the evidence be clear, as it is in ſome undeniable principles, and in their immediate Concluſions: But the aſſent built upon authority (which is *Faith*) depends in its infallibility upon the infallibility of the Infallible Authour or Proponent apprehended to be ſo by us and this independently of any Evidence we have of the truth or nature of things without us; and therefore this 20. Propoſition is abſolutely falſe.

Propoſition XXI.

It is therefore neceſſary in order to an Infallible Aſſent, that every particular perſon be infallibly aſſiſted in judging of the matter propoſed to him to be believed, ſo that the ground on which a neceſſity of ſome external infallible Proponent

ponent is asserted, must rather make every particular Person infallible, if no divine faith can be without an infallible Assent, and so renders any other infallible useless.

The 21. Proposition is also false, it being only a consequence from the former. A fallible person may give an infallible assent in matters of faith, because the truth and assurance of such an Assent is not to be measured by any inward evidence the Assenter hath of the matter of Mystery believed; but (supposing the outward appearance of the supernatural signes of the Church) by the grace that God gives to assure us, that himself is the Authour of the Doctrine so proposed: And though the appearance of the signes of the Church exceeds not a moral certainty of God being the Authour of the Churches Doctrine, yet our assurance of that same truth is more then moral, because we build not the assurance and certainty of our Catholick faith, or of the Infallibility of the Church, upon those motives of credibility, and the outward appearance of their connexion with the Truth, but upon Gods Veracity, Goodness, and his aversness from any falshood; which is so great, that we do as firmly beleeve he will no more permit a Church so likely to be his, as the Roman-Catholick Church is, to erre, and leade us into any falshood, then he would own himself Authour or Countenancer of that falshood and fraud.

Proposition XXII.

If no particular person be infallible in the assent he gives to matters proposed by others to him, then no man can be infallibly sure that the Church is infallible, and so the Churches Infallibility can signifie nothing to our infallible assurance, without an equal Infallibility in our selves in the belief of it.

The

The 22. Propoſition ſignifies nothing, if you will reflect upon what hath been now ſaid; every faithful is infallible inaſmuch as he agreeth with the Doctrine of the Church, and the Churches Infallibility is one point of that Doctrine.

The 23. Propoſition is compoſed of abſurd ſequels from the former.

The 24. 25. and 26. Propoſitions have not any thing worth our taking notice of.

Propoſition XXVII.

The nature of certainty doth receive ſeveral names, according to the nature of the proof, or the degrees of it. Thus moral certainty *may be ſo called either* &c.

In the 27. Propoſition the Authour declares, that Chriſtianity is morally certain, that is, it implys a firm aſſent upon the higheſt evidence that moral things can receive: This ſeems to involve a contradiction; How can our Aſſent be ſufficiently firm for Faith, and exclude all doubts and fears of Falſhood (as Chriſtian Faith muſt) if its certainty be only moral, though in the higheſt degree of moral certainty? For, the higheſt degree of moral certainty doth not include an abſolute impoſſibility of the contrary; So that Dr. *Stillingfleet* muſt confeſſe 'tis poſſible his Faith may be falſe, and the Scriptures a Fable, though he be morally certain in the higheſt degree it is not ſo.

Hence followeth againſt the 28. *Propoſition*, that a Chriſtian having no more then moral certainty in the Higheſt degree that the Scriptures are the Word of God, his Faith cannot be reſolved into the Veracity of God, as the ground of his believing; becauſe the

Veracity of God excludes all Fallacy and poſſibility of Falſhood, and includes not only the higheſt degree of moral, but of Metaphyſical certainty, and by conſequence every aſſent of Faith grounded thereupon, and reduced thereunto, muſt be of the ſame nature.

The 29. Propoſition confines Gods Revelations to Scripture only without proof or pretext for ſo bold an aſſertion, as we have manifeſted in confuting the 14. *Propoſition.*

Propoſition XXX.

There can be no better way to prevent mens miſtakes in the ſence of Scripture (which men being fallible are ſubject to) then the conſidering the conſequence of miſtaking in a matter wherein their ſalvation is concerned; and there can be no ſufficient reaſon given why that may not ſerve in matter of faith which God himſelf hath made uſe of, as the means to keep men from ſin in their lives, unleſs any imagin that Errors in opinion are more dangerous to mens ſouls then a vicious life is and therefore that God is bound to take more care to prevent the one then the other.

This 30. and laſt Propoſition doth not agree with the 15. and 18. For in the 15. the Author maintains, that no ſober Enquirer into the Scriptures, can miſs of what is neceſſary for ſalvation, and from thence concludes there can be no neceſſity ſuppoſed of any infallible Society of men (or of the Church of *England*) to atteſt or explain Scripture; To what purpoſe then are Biſhops, Deans Chapters and Paſtors, or at leaſt their Revenues and Tythes? May not this bring Dr. *Stillingfleet*, under the ſuſpicion and cenſure of being rather a Preva-

Prevaricator then Aſſertor of the Church of *England*, and an Impugner of the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy? His 18. Propoſition alſo deſtroys this 30. as you may ſee by comparing both: in the 18. he ſays, God hath promiſed to them who uſe their beſt endeavours or means to underſtand the Scriptures, that either they ſhall not erre, or they ſhall not be damn'd for it. From whence it follows.

1. That Scripture is obſcure even in matters neceſſary for ſalvation, contrary to the 15. Propoſition.

2. That they need not fear being damn'd, and therefore need not be concerned for erring, which is contrary to this 30. Propoſition, and indeed to all Chriſtianity, whereof St. *Paul* ſays, it is one of the firſt principles, that *without faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God*, and that Faith is the ſubſtance and foundation of Religion, and hopes of ſalvation: In this ſenſe it's certain, that errours in opinion are far more dangerous then a vicious life is, both becauſe here ie is the worſt of vices, and becauſe it is more difficult to recover true Faith once loſt, then to repent of any other ſins. You have ſeen D. *Stillingfleets* Principles cleared and confuted; Now you ſhall ſee them retorted againſt himſelf in his own Concluſions.

Concluſion I.

There is no neceſſity at all or uſe of an infallible ſociety of men to aſſure men of the truth of thoſe things which they may be certain of without it, and cannot have any greater aſſurance ſuppoſing ſuch Infallibility to be in them.

Con-

Concluſion II.

The Infallibility of that ſociety of men who call themſelves the Catholick Church, muſt be examined by the ſame faculties in man, the ſame Rules of tryal, the ſame motives by which the Infallibility of any Divine Revelation is.

Concluſion III.

The leſſe convincing the Miracles the more doubtful the Marks, the more obſcure the ſence of either what is called the Catholick Church or declared by it, the leſſe reaſon hath any Chriſtian to beleeve upon the account of any who call themſelves by the name of the Catholick Church.

Concluſion IV.

The more abſurd any Opinions are, and repugnant to the firſt Principles of ſence and reaſon, which any Church obtrudes upon the faith of men, the greater reaſon men ſtill have to reject the pretence of Infallibility in that Church as a grand Impoſture.

Concluſion V.

To diſown what is ſo taught by ſuch a Church, is not to queſtion the Veracity of God, but ſo firmly to adhere to it, as to what he hath revealed in Scriptures, that men dare not out of love to their ſouls reject what is ſo taught.

THe Firſt Concluſion hath been retorted in the 30. Propoſition againſt the Church of *England* (which Dr. *Stillingfleet* undertakes to maintain) becauſe if an intallible

infallible Church be ſuperfluous, much more ſuperfluous muſt the Church of *England* be, that is confeſſedly fallible. Nay it muſt be dangerous, becauſe by the Laws of the Land which confirm it, and by the Benefices and Revenues that enrich it, men may be induced to follow falſe doctrine, whereunto (as a fallible Church) it may leade them.

The 2. Concluſion deprives the Church and State of *England* of all hopes of peace and quiet; becauſe if a Church pretending (with good grounds) to Infallibility, muſt be judged and cenſured by every private mans reaſon and diſcretion, much more a Church that acknowledgeth to be fallible, and yet both reaſon and experience demonſtrate, that no Church or Commonwealth can be peaceable, wherein every private perſon is permitted to be a Judge of its Laws, or of its Religion.

The 3. Concluſion abſolutely deſtroys the Church of *England* becauſe it doth not as much as pretend to Miracles, nor ſupernatural viſible marks, nor to the name of the Catholick Church; and by D. *Stillingfleets* conſequence no Chriſtian ought to believe upon the account of ſuch a Church.

The 4. Concluſion is alſo deſtructive to the Church of *England* becauſe nothing is more repugnant to the firſt principles of ſence and reaſon, then that a Church confeſſedly fallible ſhould pretend to direct men to the infallible certainty of Chriſtian Faith; and that men ſhould be compelled by Laws and penalties to hazard their ſalvation by following a guide that owns not to be fully aſſured whether his own Doctrine be the right way to Heaven.

The 5. Concluſion makes it lawful for every man to reject the authority of the Church of *England*, and to

make himſelf ſole Judge of the Scriptures, and all this out of love to his ſoul, and out of reverence to Gods Veracity, which is (in equivalent terms) to make Dr. *Stillingfleets* Religion inſeparable from Hereſie and Rebellion, and inconſiſtent with the ſafety of any State or Soveraign.

Concluſion VI.

Though nothing were to be delivered as the Will of God, but what is by the Catholick Church declared to be ſo, yet this doth not at all concern the Church of Rome, which neither is the Catholick Church, nor any ſound part or member thereof. From all which it follows, that it can be nothing but wilful Ignorance, weakneſs of judgment, ſtrength of prejudice, or ſome ſinful paſſion, which makes any one forſake the Communion of the Church of England, to embrace that of the Church of Rome.

This 6. Concluſion I ſhall endeavour to confute by proving that the Roman-Catholick Church alone, is the whole Catholick Church: In order whereunto I will ſet down theſe few *Propoſitions*.

1. That there is, and always hath been, upon earth, a viſible Catholick Church, otherwiſe Chriſt would not have commanded us to repair to it in our differences, nor the Apoſtles have made it an Article of our Creed.

2. The Catholick Church muſt have ſome viſible and ſupernatural ſignes (far exceeding all others in the appearance of being ſuch) whereby it may be diſcerned from all Pagan and Heretical Congregations pretending to be a part, or the whole Catholick Church. If this be not granted, no man is obliged to be of any Church, nay

may rather all men are obliged to be of no Church, becauſe not having any ſignes to prefer one Church before the other, none could know which is the true one, and therefore it's a hundred to one, at leaſt, they would fall into ſome Heretical Congregation, there being ſo many, and the true Church or Congregation but one.

3. That no ſupernatural ſigns or Miracles can be viſible and wrought for confirmation of doctrine in any Congregation but in that one which is the true Church, becauſe the ſignes or Miracles which Chriſt ſaid would follow the Beleevers, *Mark* 16. or the true Church, are of the ſame nature of Chriſts Miracles, and in order to gain credit for the teſtimony it gives of it ſelf and his doctrine: and God being the Author of truth and concord, cannot give ſupernatural ſignes of his truſt or truth to any two or more diſſenting Churches, for if he did, the wiſeſt cour'e (as I ſaid) learned and pious men could take, would be, to turn Scepticks, and not believe in God. Hence alſo it followeth

4. That the Catholick Church cannot be compoſed of any two Congregations diſſenting in any one point, which eith'r holds to be an Article of Faith fundamental, or not fundamental: the reaſon is, becauſe if they be of equal authority men ought rather to ſuſpend then ſubmit their judgm'r t: to either of thoſe Congregations: and though both ſhould agree in fundamental Articles, yet becauſe God (being truth it ſelf) is as contrary to ſmall as great untruths or errors, he can no more permit the Teſtimony of his Church and his Miracles, to confirm a little then a great untruth, and ſo it muſt be infallible as well in not fundamentals, as in fundamenta's.

5. Gods being of infinite Veracity (as hath been proved

proved in my conſutation of Dr. *Stillingfleets* 6, 16, 17. Propoſitions) cannot permit any falſe Church to have or ſhew ſo credible an appearance of true Miracles, as hath been alwaies and now is pretended to be in the Roman-Catholick Church; They are ſo convincing, that our adverſaries can as little prove the fraud, as deny the fact; They are ſo frequent, that there is ſcarce a Countrey in Chriſtendom, wherein they have not been wrought: They are ſo authentick (I ſpeak only of ſuch as are approved by the Biſhops of *Rome*, in order to the canonization of Saints) that there cannot be a more narrow ſcrutiny into the nature and cure of the diſeaſe, nor into the ſincerity and ſufficiency of the Witneſſes, and the ſeverity of our judgments againſt ſuch as we finde to be cheats and Impoſtors, is notorious; even in *Ireland*, where our Eccleſiaſtical diſcipline is reſtrained by the Laws, we have ventured to ſilence *James Finanghty* (a ſimple ignorant Prieſt) becauſe himſelf and he who cauſed them to be printed, were ſo weak as to fancy they were true Miracles.

I know Dr. *Stillingfleet* may object againſt this Propoſition, the Miracles of Antichriſt, but his Miracles will not be of the ſame nature with the Miracles of Chriſt, and ours; he will not convert Nations to Chriſtianity, by imitating the Apoſtles humility, poverty and chaſtity, as the Apoſtolical men of our Church have done in all former ages, and even in this; Witneſſe both the *Indies*, *Braſile*, *Ethiopia*, *Perſia*, *Japan*, and *China*. Beſides, though Antichriſt's Miracles could be in appearance as palpable, and as plauſible as ours; yet (beſides the precedency and prediction of ours as true) the particular circumſtances wherewith Scripture hath deſcribed that man of ſin, and the warning it hath given

given us, not to beleeve his Miracles, do ſo diſcredit him and them, that no man who will reflect upon the Scriptures words and recurr to God for help will be deceiv'd by Antichriſt's Impoſtures, and lying Prodigies.

True it is, that according to * D. *Stillingfleets* Principles (making every particular perſon Judge of Divine Revelation, and admitting nothing as ſuch that he thinks doth contradict ſenſe in its proper object) Antichriſt's Miracles muſt be judged true Miracles, and by conſequence his Doctrine muſt be embraced as Divine Revelation: For upon this account alone doth Dr. *Stillingfleet* deny the Miracle and Myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation*, notwithſtanding the clearneſs of Scripture for it; being impoſſible to expreſs that Truth, or any other, in more clear terms, then by Chriſts ſaying, *This is my body*; ſo likewiſe it muſt be concluded from Dr. *Stillingfleets* Principles, that though Chriſt tels you clearly, Antichriſt's Miracles will not be true Miracles, yet if your eyes tels you (that is if you ſee a man lie like dead, and afterwards ſee him ſtand and move by Antichriſt's command) you muſt prefer this evidence of ſence in its proper object, before Chriſts clear words and Revelation: For, the proper object of ſenſe goes no further then to the outward appearance, or accidents; it doth not penetrate to the ſubſtance of bread or wine, much leſs to the life or ſoul of a ſeeming dead man; and by conſequence men may be miſtaken in the ſubſtance of both, though they rely upon ſenſes evidence in its proper object, which is only the *ſpecies*, or outward appearances, or (if you will follow the modern opinion) certain impreſſions made upon the Organs of our ſenſes; and this may be performed by Antichriſt, or by any o-

* See D. *Stillingfleets Anſw. pag.* 469.

ther that the devil hath a kindneſs for, without any concurrence or real exiſtence of the Object you fancy to ſee hear, ſmell, touch, or taſte; and of this we have ſufficient proofs and examples in viſions and apparitions both of good and bad ſpirits, both in ſacred and prophane Hiſtory.

We ought not therefore to attribute ſo much to the evidence of ſenſe in its moſt proper Object (it cannot have evidence in any other) as to wreſt the words of Scripture from their literal and plain ſence, in the Myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation*, ſeeing we muſt confeſs that Antichriſts falſe Miracles will have no other colour of truth, but what will be grounded upon the Evidence of ſenſe in its moſt proper Object; and if this Evidence ought not to prevail in favour of Antichriſts Miracles, I ſee no reaſon why it ought to prevail againſt Chriſts words, *This is my body.*

As for matters of faith that ſuppoſe matters of fact, the certainty of their belief doth not depend ſo much upon the ſences evidence of the fact, as D. *Stillingfleet* imagines, *pag.*469. For, we do not beleeve that any of the Apoſtles, or others, did ſee Chriſt in the very act or inſtant of his Reſurrection, though they did ſee him a little after, but they did not ſee the Reſurrection it ſelf; and though they had ſeen it, the aſſurance of their faith muſt have been grounded upon divine Revelation, not upon that ſight, So that not only ſucceeding ages, but the Apoſtles themſelves believed Chriſts Reſurrection with Chriſtian faith, not becauſe they did ſee him revived, but becauſe he told them, he was the very ſame Chriſt that had been dead, and this his aſſertion is confirmed by the ſame ſignes and teſtimonies whereby the other myſteries of Faith are.

Concluſion.

Conclusion.

SEeing therefore the whole Catholick Church cannot be composed of many or any two dissenting Congregations in any point of Faith, whether fundamental, or not fundamental, and that the same Catholick Church must have supernatural signes and Miracles whereby it may be discerned from all Heretical Congregations; and that no other * Christian Congregation, but the Roman-Catholick doth as much as pretend to supernatural signes and Miracles, and that this pretence of Miracles in the Roman-Catholick Church is so well grounded, that the wisest and wariest men of the world for many ages (and in this also) did take it to be good and sufficient evidence to build thereupon their hopes of salvation, and that such as deny the sufficiency of this evidence cannot dispute it otherwise then by saying (contrary to universal Tradition and to the Testimony of all Histories) that they who believed and wrought our Miracles were cheats or mad-men, and that there can be no greater madness then so rash an assertion; seeing, I say, all this hath been made out in my Propositions, I hope it may be evidently concluded, that the Roman-Catholick Church, and only the Roman-Catholick Church, is the whole Catholick and true Church of God. From whence must follow the quite contrary of D. *Stillingfleets* Principles and Conclusions.

* D. *Do ham in h Treatise Antichr. l.1.c.7.p 111. sait Neither Turks, n Jews, nor any other Church of Christian but only th Pope and Church of Rome do vaunt of Miracles.*

This Sir, is my Opinion of a Book so much applauded by those that understand not its Principles, nor the inconveniencies it may draw upon the Religion and Revenues of the Church of *England*, by making that Church as useless for saving souls, as its Revenues are thought by Statesmen necessary for supporting the State: I am,

March 17. 1671. Yours,

FINIS. *J.W.*

Errata.

In the Page on the back-ſide the Title, *line* 3. for *Principles of Chriſtianity*, reade *Principles of Proteſtancy*. page 6. line 14. reade *confirmed*. p. 10..l. 10. r. *which the Church then, and for*. p.12. l.5. r. S. *Xavier*.